



DEPARTMENT OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
LONG RANGE PLANNING

PLANNING COMMISSION TRANSMITTAL

TO: Board of Clark County Commissioners

FROM: Vaughn Lein, Planning Commission Chair

PREPARED BY: Patrick Lee, Long Range Planning Manager

DATE: April 4, 2001

SUBJECT: Planning Commission Comprehensive Plan Update
Recommendations

CASE NUMBER: #99-003 Five-Year Review, Planning Commission

I. Introduction

Over the past twenty months, Clark County and each city within the county have been revisiting comprehensive land use plans. During Phase 1 (August 1999–June 2000) of Clark County's comprehensive plan review process, key questions were identified that would need to be answered through the update process. Phase 2, the current phase (July 2000–March 2001), will end with major policy direction from the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) that staff will apply in Phase 3 (April 2001--March 2002) to determine if actual changes in comprehensive plan policies, land use and capital facilities plans are needed. Any proposed changes will be reviewed by the Planning Commission (PC) and the BOCC through a second hearings process in Fall 2001--Winter 2002.

The PC recommendations contained in this report reflect public input (see Section II), discussions by the Steering Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and testimony presented at joint hearings of the PC and BOCC held in February and March 2001. These recommendations reflect the best information currently available. The decisions in Phase 2 primarily provide the starting point for additional technical analysis and public input to take place in Phase 3. Additional information will be generated in Phase 3 that may result in some reconsideration of the policy direction

prior to making final decisions on the comprehensive plan review at the close of Phase 3.

Recommendations from the PC are presented in two sections: Section III includes recommendations already made to the BOCC; Section IV includes recommendations on the key policy issues that were the subject of joint hearings with the BOCC during February--March 2001.

II. Public Involvement

Each of the key policy issues was discussed by the Steering Committee comprised of the BOCC and elected officials from the cities. The Steering Committee has participated, and will continue to participate, in all phases of the comprehensive plan review. The PC reviewed the issues in a series of six meetings in the fall of 2000 and received public testimony on the key policy issues.

A significant public involvement program was carried out in Phase 2 to inform the discussion. The components of the program were identified by the BOCC in May of 2000 and carried out between August and December 2000. Products of the public involvement program were reviewed by the PC on December 7, 2000 and by the BOCC on January 24, 2001. Another major public involvement effort will be initiated to inform the discussion in Phase 3.

III. Previous Planning Commission Recommendations

On November 30, 2000 the PC made formal recommendations to the BOCC on the following policy issues:

A. Should the county consider changes to urban growth boundaries at five-year intervals or on some other schedule?

The BOCC adopted the year 2000 dockets via Ordinance 2000-12-16 on December 12, 2000. One of the dockets (see Section 6 of the ordinance) revised language for Countywide Planning Policy 1.1(f). This synchronized the five-year review time frames with the requirements of RCW 36.70A.215 that calls for completion of the first "Buildable Lands Capacity Report" by jurisdictions planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA) by September 1, 2002. The PC had originally reviewed this language on June 15, 2000, and validated on November 30, 2000, by a 5-0 vote that the language should be revised as proposed in the docket.

B. Should development regulations be developed for urban reserves to ensure that interim development does not preclude efficient transition to urban development?

The PC, by a 5-0 vote, recommended that no new development regulations be adopted for urban reserves. The commission did comment, however, that it was desirable to

better plan the urban reserves prior to the time they would need to be brought into the urban growth boundaries. The PC also requested staff to take a look at some “housekeeping” of urban reserve and other policies as the comprehensive plan review moves forward.

C. How do land use plans identify and reserve transportation corridors for meeting long-term needs?

The PC, by a 5-0 vote, recommended a new symbol be included on the arterial atlas to denote anticipated future (post 20-year) transportation corridor needs. Such needs should be demarcated by wide conceptual shading on the map. They would have no regulatory effect, but would be used to advise landowners, citizens, and staff that there may be a long-term transportation need. A regional study would be undertaken to delineate the type of transportation facilities that were appropriate for each corridor and to more precisely align the location within the shaded areas. A property affected by such corridors would not be obligated to dedicate right-of-way or to construct improvements until such a study was completed. The result would be the removal of the corridor symbol and replacement by the appropriate transportation facility designation in the arterial atlas.

IV. Policy Questions and Planning Commission Recommendations

The PC recommendations are grouped according to when the issues were considered during the four joint PC/BOCC public hearings held in February--March 2001. The title of each section identifies the hearing at which testimony on the related issues was heard. Each issue includes a brief discussion, what staff recommended and what the PC recommendation to the BOCC is.

1. Population and Employment Recommendations (February 1, 2001)

The population and employment forecast methodology questions are combined in this report, rather than being discussed separately.

A. What planning horizon will the county use?

The purpose of deciding what planning horizon and population to use is to plan for the number of people realistically expected to locate in Clark County. The state's Office of Financial Management (OFM) develops a low, a medium and a high growth projection for the county over the 20-year planning period.

OFM has provided the county with an interim low, medium and high population forecast for 2020. It is anticipated that final population numbers will become available in late fall of 2001. Therefore, staff is looking to the BOCC for direction regarding the optimal planning horizon and number of people on which to base the plan review. Any significant discrepancy between the “interim “ population figure chosen by the BOCC

and the final OFM range would have to be resolved prior to completion of the comprehensive plan review.

Staff recommended using a 2022 planning horizon pursuant to RCW 36.70A (of the GMA) which requires a 20-year planning horizon. Adoption of any changes that may result from this review are currently anticipated in early 2002, making 2022 the 20-year horizon.

PC Recommendation: The PC voted 6-0 to recommend 2022 as the planning horizon, consistent with the staff recommendation.

B. What population forecast should be used?

The GMA requires that Clark County plan for a 20-year population level that falls into the range provided by OFM. OFM will provide new population projections for initial review based on the year 2000 Census in July or August of 2001; however, those numbers will not be officially finalized until the beginning of 2002. In the meantime, OFM has provided the county with interim population projections for 2020 spanning from 419,188 on the low end to around 500,000 in the middle to 587,622 on the high end. These forecast numbers reflect growth rates between 1 percent on the low end to 2.5 percent on the high end. Historical population growth in the county has been over 3 percent.

OFM recommended the medium range as being the most likely scenario. Historic growth in Clark County has been consistently at the high end. Staff recommended a selection between the medium and high projection, reflecting a growth rate of 2.1 percent, annualized.

PC Recommendation: The PC voted 6-0 to recommend using an annualized growth rate of 2.1 percent. (Staff calculates this to be a projected population of approximately 545,000 in 2022).

C. What employment forecast should be used?

The Washington State Employment Securities Division developed an employment forecast methodology that is tied to anticipated population growth. Based on the demographic profile of the population a workforce population is estimated. Work force participation rates and unemployment assumptions are applied. Two scenarios are developed: one with continued high levels of commuting to Oregon, and one which assumes that congestion will dampen this flow over time. The lower commuting scenario results in a higher job growth in Clark County.

Staff recommended applying the lower commuting scenario methodology to the population level identified by the BOCC.

PC Recommendation: The PC voted 6-0 to recommend applying the lower commuting scenario to the population level identified by the BOCC, consistent with the

staff recommendation. The commission also requested that staff develop an implementation strategy, to be presented in Phase 3 of the comp plan review, that would tangibly support an aggressive job creation effort.

D. How should projected population and employment be allocated to each jurisdiction?

As indicated in the introduction, population numbers will provide a starting point in the planning process rather than an end point. Staff recommended allocating population and employment growth based first on lands identified as vacant or underutilized in each UGA by the Vacant and Buildable Lands Model, and then applying planning policy assumptions as they are decided on by the BOCC. Then, once all identified properties in existing UGAs reach capacity, the remaining allocation would be negotiated. The comprehensive plan update technical advisory committee should be directed to develop a proposed remainder allocation and review with the steering committee. Each jurisdiction's public process and governing body's preferences can be discussed at the steering committee. Ultimately, the BOCC will finalize the allocation in Phase 3 of the review.

Two constraints will guide the negotiated allocation: the overall negotiated settlement must result in anticipated population growth that falls between the final low and high OFM forecast; and anticipated growth in each jurisdiction must be consistent with the Community Framework Plan.

PC Recommendation: The PC voted 6-0 to recommend using the two-step process outlined above, consistent with the staff recommendation.

2. UGB Movement and Designation of Additional Industrial and Commercial Lands (February 8, 2001)

A. Should Urban Growth Areas be expanded?

The urban growth boundaries adopted by the county in its 1994 Plan were designated to accommodate 20 years of growth. Now, six years into this planning period, the county is assessing the performance of the plan, the related development regulations, and the availability of buildable lands.

The growth management plan and codes adopted in the county provide guidance on how we monitor and accommodate projected growth. Additionally, the Growth Management Hearings Board found the need for a more precise instrument to assist with the decision of when boundary amendments should occur. The instrument that was created to address boundary changes is the county's 75 percent/50 percent threshold for land consumption.

Staff recommended the following method, which follows current plan policies and county code:

- 1) Designate the total amount of land necessary to meet projected demands during the adopted planning period as Urban Reserve. When the primary “Trigger” (75/50 land consumed) is reached for a specific urban area:
 - a) The county responds only to a request from the affected city to consider such an expansion. The applicant city would prepare the necessary justification to support such an expansion:
 - b) Such justification would include the environmental review, proposed land uses and capacity of those lands to accommodate those uses, a Capital Facilities Plan showing that the facilities needed are affordable (and at what level of service):

In addition, the county should be assured that the proposed urban reserve areas to be included in UGA’s will be annexed concurrently or shortly after the UGA boundaries are expanded.

Another variable that could influence questions of UGA expansion is the buildable lands legislation (SB 6094) adopted by the 1997 legislature and codified as RCW 36.70A.215 (Attachment A). The deadline for filing the first buildable lands report is September 1, 2002, but staff has been integrating it into the comprehensive plan review. A draft of the 6094 report should be available for Board of County Commissioners review later this spring.

PC Recommendation: The PC voted 5-1 to concur with the staff recommendation.

B. Should Additional Industrial/Commercial Lands Be Designated? Where?

Existing policy directs that 75 percent of the vacant and buildable commercial land supply identified in 1994 be consumed prior to allocating additional commercial land through UGA expansion. From the table on page 3 of the February 8 staff report, the consumption threshold for commercial land designation is not being met in most UGA’s. There is some concern that insufficient land may have been allocated for commercial uses in 1994. The 1994 land supply shows a potential deficit of 236 acres of the commercial land needed in the Vancouver UGA. However, it was recognized that non-commercial zones permit commercial activity. The policy decision at that time was to monitor the extent of development that is occurring in non-commercial zones to see if the deficit materializes, rather than adding commercial land to the inventory. For prime industrial land, on a countywide basis, the 50 percent threshold is being met. A major policy issue is whether or not to designate additional land for industrial uses to increase the inventory of prime industrial land or to make the necessary investments to convert secondary or tertiary industrial lands to prime (or some combination of both).

Staff recommended that no additional commercial lands be designated until after policy direction is received on population and employment projections. Staff recommended that an examination of the secondary and tertiary industrial lands be conducted to determine the feasibility of their conversion to prime industrial lands prior to any designation of additional industrial lands.

PC Recommendation: The PC voted 5-1 to concur with the staff recommendation.

One issue that was discussed at the hearing was the Vacant and Buildable Lands Model (VBLM), which provides important technical background for the questions that are the focus of the plan update effort. The BOCC, however, did not ask the PC for a recommendation on the assumptions used for the model.

3. Rural Density Issues (February 22, 2001)

A. Should the county continue to plan for 19 percent of new growth to be in the rural areas and 81 percent in the urban areas?

In 1994 the urban/rural population split was about 80/20. With the GMA encouraging most growth to occur in urban areas, the county assumed that ratio would continue. The adopted plan predicts that by 2012, 81 percent of the population would be inside urban growth areas and 19 percent would be outside. This split was seen as easily achievable since it reflected existing population distribution and could be used as a benchmark for monitoring new population distribution patterns.

At this time the rural areas of the county have an estimated potential additional capacity of around 13,000 dwelling units. At 2.6 persons per household, the rural area can accommodate about 35,300 new residents (which at 81/19 would be 19 percent of 184,210 residents). The current county population is 345,000, and the 20-year forecasts (extended to 2022) add anywhere from 83,000 to 273,000 people. So, for any OFM population estimate over the medium high range, a 19 percent/81 percent split means that every potential residential lot in the rural area would be built out.

Alternatives. Three alternatives were considered:

1. Consider the population split a measurement tool, not a standard.
2. Retain the current split of 81/19 and make it a clear goal to achieve.
3. Adopt an assumed new split concurrent with a new population forecast.

Staff recommended no change to current policy by adoption of alternative 1. This provides the community with an ongoing measurement tool and the decision makers with a benchmark to make decisions, but does not dictate a change in land use designations if the “standard” isn’t met.

PC Recommendation: The PC voted 6-0 to recommend that the population split should be a measurement tool and not a standard, consistent with the staff recommendation. The PC suggested the split be rechecked when the final census population numbers are out.

B. What density is appropriate for rural areas?

The Steering Committee did not discuss this issue to any extent. The current split indicates about 80 percent of the new growth will occur in urban areas and about 20 percent in rural areas. The intent of the split was related to urban allocation of population and allocating a reasonable estimate of population expected to occur in the rural areas. Based on the examination of existing zoning, there are approximately 13,577 buildable lots in the rural area (July, 2000 Plan Monitoring Report, page 51). Assuming 2.6 persons per household, overall additional rural capacity is approximately 35,300 persons at build-out.

Staff recommended no change in current policy by adoption of Alternative 1 in Section 3.A above. Requests for intensification of land use in the rural area should be considered pursuant to existing land use and zoning. Many site-specific requests have been, and will continue to be, submitted for review and will be analyzed in phase 3 of the review. However it is important to note that this issue is critically linked to the urban/rural population split policy above, and to the overall population the county and its cities choose to plan for.

PC Recommendation: The PC voted 6-0 to concur with the staff recommendation.

C. Should land uses inside existing rural centers be altered? Should rural center boundaries be adjusted?

To answer these and other questions on rural center issues the county convened a rural centers task force in July 2000. Staff presented information on zoning, the current land use and the presence of split-zoned parcels in each rural center. The task force also entertained public requests, which led to generation of all of the recommendations. The task force recommended that four parcels be changed from RC-1 to CR-2 and that 12 parcels be changed from RC-2.5 to RC-1 in the Meadow Glade and Brush Prairie rural centers. Neither of the proposed changes results in any significant change in rural carrying capacity. With regard to boundary changes the task force is only recommending the addition of eight parcels (about 66 acres), all to the Chelatchie Prairie rural center.

Staff supports the Task Force recommendations, which if accepted will be considered along with the other site-specific requests to be analyzed as part of the comprehensive plan review process.

PC Recommendation: The PC voted 6-0 to concur with the staff recommendation.

4. Housing Density Issues (March 1, 2001)

A. Should the County continue to plan for 60 percent single-family and 40 percent multi-family development? If so, should that requirement be for each urban growth area or for the county as a whole?

B. Should the County continue to pursue an urban density of 6 units per acre single-family, and 16 for multi-family?

C. Should the County adopt an overall, or average, density target to replace the single-family/multi-family goals and density targets?

These issues were addressed jointly by the PC because of their inter-relationship. For example, the intent of the 60/40 housing split was to provide for a variety of housing types and sizes so that builders could provide affordable and attainable housing for first-time buyers, retirees, and lower-income families.

One of the goals of the Community Framework Plan (CFP) is achieving a 60/40 housing split for new residential development. The goal was later translated into the Land Use and Housing Policy, which the cities endorsed. The Growth Management Board remanded this issue back to the county and smaller cities on the grounds that the smaller cities' plans did not adequately address the housing split or affordability issues. As a result, the county and smaller cities adopted policy 5.7.1 on the provision of opportunities for new development to occur in a housing type ratio of 60 percent single-family and 40 percent multi-family.

The intent of the policy, and the intent of the Hearings Board in its remand, was to ensure that all communities in the county provide a variety of housing types and forms. Through a variety of housing types and choices, the assumption was that the "affordability" objectives would also be met. The policy makes the assumption that multi-family housing (including duplexes, apartments and townhouses) is key to achieving a variety of housing choices.

Secondly, the policy specifies a share of multi-family housing in the community as an implicit way to meet the density objectives of the comprehensive plans. The higher density commonly found in multi-family housing is necessary to meet the density and affordability objectives.

While the 6/16 average single-family/multi-family density assumption is not a policy, it was one of the primary factors used to determine how large urban growth areas must be to accommodate population targets. It was assumed that given the variety of single-family and multi-family zoning, new development would occur at an average of 6 and 16 units per net acre, respectively.

The Community Framework Plan (CFP) envisions similar densities in major centers, which have or will have urban densities of development between 6 and 10 units per net residential acre. Small towns and Community Centers will average between 4 and 8 units per net residential acre.

The purpose in the density goals is to attain a compact urban pattern. A compact urban pattern is consistent with goals 1, 2, and 4 of the GMA. Any change in density goals should be considered in the context of these provisions.

Discussion of Alternatives

The PC reviewed the following table, which identifies a range of policy alternatives that could be considered relative to housing split and density issues. Combined carrying capacities of all urban growth areas are shown to indicate the implications of each alternative.

Option	Prescriptive Equivalents*	Net Density du/ac	Total Dwelling Units**
	Observed, 95-00	5.59	30639
1	94 Plan. 60/40 & 6/16	8	43849
2	Lower densities (e.g. 4 / 12)	5.5	30146
3	Retain Density of 6/16, and go to 75/25 SF/MF	7.14	39135
4	Cities Proposal of 4/6/8	7.09	38861
5	Eliminate 60/40 and go to 6 average density overall	6	32887
6	Eliminate 60/40 and go to 8 average density overall	8	43849
<p>* For Option 4, small cities (Yacolt, La Center, Ridgefield) calculated as 8 percent of total buildable acres in all County UGA's; Midsize cities (Battle Ground, Camas, Washougal) as 28 percent of total, and Vancouver UGA as 64 percent of total.</p> <p>** Capacity for units in UGA's from the Supply Analysis of September, 2000</p>			

The options are discussed below.

Option One: The current plan calls for a 60/40 percent housing split and 6/16 single-family/multi-family density target which averages out to a density of 8 dwelling units per net acre for all urban growth areas. The same standard was applied to each UGA. The 60/40 policy provides the primary measurable goal for achieving a mix of housing types and a housing stock with sufficient affordable units. The county's comprehensive plan and implementing zoning regulations and most of the cities' comprehensive plan and zoning districts were amended upon adoption of the 1994 Plan to provide the opportunity for this housing split to be achieved.

Maintaining the current policy would ensure that a variety of housing opportunities are provided in each UGA, consistent with the GMA. Existing policy also limits pressure toward UGA movement, since the overall 8 units per acre density yield enables the highest population to be accommodated in existing urban areas of the options shown. This is also consistent with the GMA's thrust toward compact development. As we are about one third of the way into the planning horizon of the existing plan (2012), staying the course would allow continued monitoring of the plan's performance, without a shift in policy, to determine if trends suggested by Vancouver's trend will continue.

Option Two: Maintain a 60/40 housing split in each UGA, but reduce the anticipated density to the low end of the density ranges anticipated in the Community Framework

Plan (4 units per acre single-family, 12 units per acre multi-family). This option would result in an overall density yield of 5.5 units per acre in UGA's. This is less than observed densities and could result in a more dispersed development pattern than currently being experienced. The least amount of growth of all alternatives could be accommodated within existing UGA's, and pressure for movement of urban growth boundaries could be greatest if this alternative were adopted.

Option Three: Change the single-family/multi-family housing ratio for new development to 75/25, but maintain the single-family/multi-family density assumptions of 6/16 used to size UGA's under the existing plan. The cities believe that the 75/25 housing split will provide them greater opportunity than the current policy to develop the character of their jurisdictions as articulated in their community visions. Because of the higher percentage of single-family development allowed under this alternative, the capacity of existing urban areas to accommodate growth will be less than if the current policy is maintained.

Option Four: Pursue a "tiered approach" to housing opportunities based on the projected size of jurisdictions. The housing mix (75/25) and density assumptions (8/6/4 units per acre depending on community size) result in less capacity to accommodate growth in existing urban areas than the current policy. The proposal calls for density targets of 4 in the smallest three UGA's (Yacolt; La Center; Ridgefield), 6 in the middle three UGA's (Battle Ground; Camas; Washougal), and 8 in the Vancouver UGA. This proposal responds to concerns that the current policy is too much of a prescriptive one-size-fits-all approach to planning. Cities would be able to tailor their development pattern pursuant to their own vision of their desired community character. They also prefer the lower residential density standard.

Option Five: Eliminates the housing split goal and establishes a performance objective of achieving a density of six units per acre in each UGA. This provides jurisdictions the opportunity for tremendous flexibility in approving housing product types that may be most in keeping with community character, provided that a certain overall density of residential development is achieved. It may also promote greater innovation in the residential development market place. At six units to the acre, however, less growth could be accommodated in existing UGA's than following existing policy.

Option Six: This is similar to Option Five, but the density objective increases from six to eight units to the acre. This has the same advantages of Option Five but also maintains the current carrying capacity of the existing UGA's to accommodate growth. Eight units per acre is the overall density yield assumed when applying existing policies to urban growth sizing. It is also likely that a higher percentage of multi-family units may be constructed to accommodate future population than would be the case in Option 5. Thus, there is a higher probability that a wide range of housing choices will be provided to residents of the county.

Staff recommended Option Six, which would eliminate the 60/40 housing split and substitute a performance objective of 8 units per net acre overall regardless of the locally chosen housing mix. The 8 units per net acre applies to each UGA.

PC Recommendation: The PC voted 6-0 to recommend eliminating the 60/40 housing split and to go with a tiered approach to density based on city size, which most closely resembles Option 4. However, there was not consensus on the densities for each tier, nor on the list of cities to be included in each tier. There was support for 8.5/7/5, 8.5/6/4, 8/6/4 and 8/6. At least two commissioners agreed with the staff recommendation of 8 units per net acre, with the tiered approach as a fallback position.

D. Should the County revise policies to influence affordability of housing?

The currently adopted set of policies and goals (listed in the March 1 staff report) was originally crafted to provide the opportunity for constructing a stock of affordable housing units. Goals 5.1-5.7 relate to affordability and are meant to direct the development of appropriate (including affordable) housing. Of these, only goal 5.7 is included as part of Long Range Planning efforts. Goal 5.7 is to “Support a shift in the mix of housing types in the community, while improving home ownership tenure.”

Staff recommended:

- 1) Retaining Goals 5.1 through 5.6 as currently written;
- 2) Modifying Goal 5.7 to support a mix of housing types at 8 units per net acre; and
- 3) Modifying Policy 5.7.1 to eliminate the reference to a 60/40 housing ratio.

PC Recommendation: The PC voted 6-0 to recommend elimination of the 60/40 housing ratio and to use a tiered approach to housing density. As such, their recommendation agreed with staff’s recommendation except for using the tiered approach to density rather than a straight 8 units per net acre.

A summary of the PC’s recommendations is contained in the matrix attached to this report as Attachment B.

ATTACHMENT B: PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION TABLE

POLICY QUESTIONS	POLICY OPTIONS <i>(CURRENT POLICY ON TOP)</i>	STAFF RECOMMENDATION	PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION
<p>What planning horizon will the county use?</p> <p>(Feb. 1, 2001)</p>	<p>1) The state's Office of Financial Management develops a low, medium and high growth projection for the over the 20-year planning period. Our current Comprehensive Plan is based on the high growth projection of 1.75 percent each year to 2012. RCW 36.70A (Growth Management Act –GMA) requires a 20-year planning horizon. Adoption of any changes that may result from the Plan review are currently anticipated in early 2002, making 2022 the 20-year horizon.</p> <p>2) Alternatively, Clark County is not required to plan for a new 20-year horizon until 2003-4. This review could simply update the 2012 population projection and revisit comprehensive plan policies according to the process under RCW36.70A.215, the "buildable lands" program.</p>	<p>Staff recommended alternative 1, plan using a 2022 horizon.</p>	<p>Adopt staff recommendation for a 2022 planning horizon. (March 22, 2001)</p>
<p>What population projection will be used?</p> <p>(Feb. 1, 2001)</p>	<p>The GMA requires that Clark County plan for a 20-year population level that falls into the range provided by the State Office of Financial Management (OFM). OFM has provided Clark County with an interim planning population projection for 2020 ranging from 419,188 on the low end to around 500,000 in the middle to 587,622 on the high end. These forecast numbers reflect growth rates between 1% on the low end to 2.5% on the high end. Historical population growth in Clark County has been over 3%. OFM will provide new preliminary population projections for initial review based on the year 2000 Census in July or August of 2001. Final Census-based projections are anticipated to be available in December 2001 or January 2002.</p>	<p>OFM recommended the medium range as being the most likely scenario. Staff recommended a growth forecast somewhere between the medium and high projection, reflecting a growth rate just over 2%, annualized.</p> <p>Regardless of the planning horizon chosen, the current population figures should be updated to the most current available from OFM prior to conclusion of the comprehensive plan review.</p>	<p>Adopt staff recommendation for using a 2.1% annualized growth rate. (March 15, 2001)</p>
<p>What employment projection will be used?</p> <p>(Feb. 1, 2001)</p>	<p>The GMA does not mandate an employment projection that Clark County must plan for. Clark County has relied on Scott Bailey, regional labor economist for the Washington State Employment Securities Division, for an employment forecast that is tied to anticipated population growth. For this plan review, two scenarios has been developed: one with continued high levels of commuting to Oregon, and one which assumes that congestion will dampen this flow over time. The lower commuting scenario results in a higher job growth in Clark County.</p>	<p>Staff recommended applying the lower commuting scenario methodology developed by Scott Bailey to the population level identified by the Board of County Commissioners.</p>	<p>Adopt staff recommendation applying the lower commuting scenario, contingent on an implementation scheme. (March 15, 2001)</p>
<p>How should projected population and employment be allocated to each jurisdiction?</p> <p>(Feb 1, 2001)</p>	<p>1) In 1994 employment was allocated to UGA based on a jobs/population ratio.</p> <p>2) For this review a two-step process is proposed: Begin the allocation by "building-out" vacant or underutilized land in each UGA using the GIS model and applying planning policy assumptions determined through the hearing process. Negotiate a final allocation among jurisdictions that addresses the balance of unallocated growth remaining once all identified land in existing UGAs reaches capacity.</p>	<p>Staff recommended the two-step process in alternative 2.</p>	<p>Adopt staff recommendation for using the two-step process (March 15, 2001)</p>

POLICY QUESTIONS	POLICY OPTIONS <i>(CURRENT POLICY ON TOP)</i>	STAFF RECOMMENDATION	PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION
<p>Should the county continue to plan for 19% of new growth to be in rural areas and 81% in urban areas?</p> <p>(Feb. 22, 2001)</p>	<p>In 1994 the urban/rural population split was about 80/20. The adopted plan predicts that by 2012, 81 percent of the population would be inside urban growth areas and 19 percent would be outside.</p> <p>1) Consider the population split a measurement tool, not a standard. This option provides the cities and county with information to determine whether, or when, plan policies should be amended to increase or decrease the development opportunities in the rural area.</p> <p>2) Make an 81/19% split a clear goal to achieve. As a constant standard over time, the 19% population “standard” would drive changes to rural and resource designations that result in increasing the densities in the rural area, if the county continues to grow.</p> <p>3) Adopt an assumed new split concurrent with a new population forecast.</p>	<p>Staff recommended maintaining current policy, alternative 1. This provides the community with an ongoing measurement tool, the decision makers with a benchmark to make decisions, but does not dictate a change in land use designations if the “standard” isn’t met.</p>	<p>Adopt staff recommendation maintaining the current policy. It was suggested the split be rechecked when the final population numbers are out. (March 15, 2001)</p>
<p>What density is appropriate for rural areas?</p> <p>(Feb. 22, 2001)</p>	<p>The Growth Management Act does not specify any definitive density threshold for rural areas. However, measures governing rural development are to ensure that rural development is contained, visual compatibility with the surrounding rural area is maintained, conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling low density development is precluded, critical areas are protected and conflicts with agricultural, forest and mineral resource lands are precluded. A minimum lot size of one dwelling unit per five acres was used in the 1994 Plan to accomplish these objectives. Larger lot sizes were also a part of the Plan to buffer resource lands and to ensure continuing opportunities for small-scale farming and forestry operations.</p> <p>Based on the examination of existing zoning, there are 13,577 buildable lots in the rural area (July, 2000 Plan Monitoring Report, page 51).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assuming 2.6 persons per household, overall additional rural capacity is approximately 35,300 persons at buildout. Assuming 3.0 persons per household, overall additional rural capacity is approximately 40,731 persons at buildout. 	<p>Continue existing policy. Consider changes in land use in the rural area on a case by case basis within the framework of comprehensive plan policies and zoning regulations.</p>	<p>Adopt staff recommendation to continue existing policy. (March 15, 2001)</p>
<p>Should land uses inside existing rural centers be altered? Should rural center boundaries be adjusted?</p>	<p>The Rural Centers Task Force has recommended minor changes to both existing rural center boundaries and land uses within the Meadow Glade and Brush Prairie Rural Centers. Neither of the proposed changes results in any significant change in rural carrying capacity. With regards to the boundary issue the task force is only recommending a change to the boundary of the Chelatchie Prairie rural center.</p>	<p>Support Rural Center Task Force recommendations</p>	<p>Adopt staff recommendation to support Rural Center Task Force recommendations. (March 15, 2001)</p>

POLICY QUESTIONS	POLICY OPTIONS <i>(CURRENT POLICY ON TOP)</i>	STAFF RECOMMENDATION	PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION
(Feb. 22, 2001)			
Should the county continue to pursue an urban density of 6 units per acre in single-family districts and 16 units per acre in multi-family districts?	<p>The current planning assumption is that new construction should average 6 housing units per acre for single-family development and 16 units per acre for multi-family developments.</p> <p>See the 60/40 Housing Split Policy Question below. A range of housing split/density options is presented jointly there because of their close interrelationship.</p>	Staff recommended substituting a performance objective of 8 units per net acre overall for new construction for the 6/16 assumption	<p>There was support for using both a tiered approach and 8 units per net acre overall. There was no consensus on what densities should make up the tiers. There was support for 8.5/7/5, 8.5/6/4, 8/6/4, and 8/6. (March 22, 2001)</p>
(Mar. 1, 2001)			
Should the county adopt an overall, or average, density target to replace the single-family/multi-family goals and density targets?	See the 60/40 Housing Split Policy Question below. A range of housing split/density options is presented jointly there because of their close interrelationship.	Staff recommended the 8 unit per net acre apply to each Urban Growth Area.	(see recommendation above) (March 22, 2001)
(Mar. 1, 2001)			
Should the county continue to plan for 60% single-family and 40% multi-family development? If so, should that requirement be for each urban growth area or for the county as a whole?	<p>The current policy states that new housing construction should be 40 percent multi-family (apartments, condominiums, etc.) and 60 percent single-family within each UGA. Following is a range of policy alternatives that could be considered relative to housing split and density issues:</p> <p>1) Maintain the current 60/40 percent housing split and 6/16 single-family/multi-family density target with resultant net density of 8 units per acre.</p> <p>2) Lower densities (e.g. 4/12) with an overall net density of 5.5 units per acre.</p> <p>3) Retain Density of 6/16, and go to 75/25 SF/MF with overall density yield of 7.14 units per acre.</p> <p>4) Establish a “tiered approach” to density based on the size of jurisdictions. The housing mix is 75/25 and a density target of 4/6/8 units per acre depending on the community size.</p> <p>5) Eliminate the housing split and establish a density of 6 units per net acre in each</p>	Staff recommended option 6.	The Planning Commission agreed with staff on eliminating the 60/40 split, replacing it with density requirements. (March 22, 2001)
(Mar. 1, 2001)			

POLICY QUESTIONS	POLICY OPTIONS <i>(CURRENT POLICY ON TOP)</i>	STAFF RECOMMENDATION	PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION
	urban growth area. 6) Eliminate 60/40 housing split and go to 8 units per acre average net density overall.		
Should the county revise policies to influence affordability of housing? (Mar. 1, 2001)	The 60/40 housing split is an important land use tool to provide a range of housing choice and housing cost opportunities in the county. Several non-land use tools are also identified in the comprehensive plan. The current county goals and policies relating to housing affordability are detailed in the March 1, 2001 Staff Report (pages 3 and 8).	Staff recommended retaining goals 5.1 through 5.6 as currently written. Modify 5.7 (on page 8 of the Staff Report) and 5.7.1 on page 3) to be consistent with the housing split/density recommendations above. Strike reference to shifting the mix of housing in 5.7 and to a 60/40 housing ratio in 5.7.1.	Adopt staff recommendation. (March 22, 2001)
Should urban growth areas be expanded? (Feb. 8, 2001)	The current Clark County code indicates that boundaries are moved only if development has occurred on 75 percent of buildable residential or commercial land, or 50 percent of prime industrial land. This can be done once every five years during the plan review. The Clark County 20-Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan provides additional guidance on how to address boundary changes.	Staff recommended method follows current plan policies and county code: 1) Designate the total amount of land necessary to meet projected demands during the adopted planning period as Urban Reserve. When the primary "Trigger" (75/50 land consumed) is reached for a specific urban area: a) The county responds only to a request from the affected City to consider such an expansion. The applicant City would prepare the necessary justification to support such an expansion: b) Such justification would include the environmental review, proposed land uses and capacity of those lands to accommodate those uses, a Capital Facilities Plan showing that the facilities needed are affordable (and at what level of service): In addition, the county should be assured that the proposed urban reserve areas to be included in the Urban Area will be annexed concurrently or shortly after the Urban Growth Boundary is expanded.	Adopt staff recommendation. (March 22, 2001)
Should additional industrial/commercial lands be designated? Where? (Feb. 8, 2001)	The current Clark County code indicates that boundaries are moved only if development has occurred on 75 percent of buildable residential or commercial land, or 50 percent.	Same as above.	(see recommendation above). (March 22, 2001)
Should urban reserve boundaries be adjusted?	One of the current criteria used to determine where and how much land should be added to the urban area says that the amendment shall be within an urban reserve or urban reserve overlay area. This can be done once every five years during the plan review.	Same as above.	(see recommendation above). (March 22, 2001)

POLICY QUESTIONS	POLICY OPTIONS <i>(CURRENT POLICY ON TOP)</i>	STAFF RECOMMENDATION	PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION
(Feb. 8, 2001)			

POLICY QUESTIONS		PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION
Should the county consider changes to urban growth boundaries at five-year intervals or on some other scheduled? (Nov. 30, 2000)		The Planning Commission had originally reviewed this issue on June 15, 2000, and validated on November 30, 2000, by a 5-0 vote that the changes made to the countywide planning Policy no. Chapter 1, Section 1.1 (f) should be revised as proposed to meet the requirements of RCW 36.70A.215 which called for completion of the first “Buildable Lands Capacity Report” by jurisdictions planning under the Growth Management Act by September 1, 2002.
Should development regulations be developed for urban reserves to ensure that interim development does not preclude efficient transition to urban development? (Nov. 30, 2000)		The Planning Commission, by a 5-0 vote, recommended that no new development regulations be adopted for urban reserve. The Planning Commission did comment, however, that it was desirable to better plan the urban reserve prior to the time they would need to be brought into the urban growth boundaries.
How do land use plans identify and reserve transportation corridors for meeting long-term needs? (Nov. 30, 2000)		The Planning Commission, by a 5-0 vote, recommended a new symbol be included on the arterial atlas to denote anticipated future (post twenty-year) transportation corridor needs.